

THE AIRSAR/TOPSAR INTEGRATED MULTI-FREQUENCY POLARIMETRIC AND INTERFEROMETRIC SAR PROCESSOR

Jakob J. Van Zyl, Anhua Chu, Scott Hensley, Yunling Lou, Yunjin Kim, Soren N. Madsen

Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology
4800 Oak Grove Drive, MS 300-227
Pasadena, California 91109
email: jacobv@blacks.jpl.nasa.gov

I. INTRODUCTION

Research on the utility of Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) data in many diverse applications has seen great activity in the past decade. In particular, two powerful SAR techniques emerged during this time. **Polarimetric** SARs were first demonstrated during the 1980's and is described by van Zyl *et al.* [1] and Zebker *et al.* [2]. Since then **polarimetric** SAR data have been applied to most disciplines of Earth Science. A recent summary of these investigations can be found in [3]. The second powerful SAR technique that has received much attention lately is SAR interferometry. While first published by Graham [4] in the 1970's, interest in this technique has steadily increased since the demonstration of SAR **interferometry** using digital processing [5]. For a summary of the different applications of SAR **interferometry**, please see [6].

To really derive the maximum information content from SAR data, it is desirable to combine **polarimetric** and interferometric techniques, preferably at multiple frequencies. The NASA/JPL AIRSAR/TOPSAR system [14] is capable of simultaneously acquiring **interferometric** (C- and/or L-band) and **polarimetric** data (C-, L- and P-band). In this paper we describe a processing approach that is used to process data acquired in these modes. This approach is different from that de-scribed by Madsen *et al.* [7] in both the motion compensation approach, as well as in the *sense* that data **are deskewed** before **interferograms** are formed. Using this approach, the same basic SAR processor is used to process data squired in any of the modes supported by the AIRSAR/TOPSAR system.

II. THE AIRSAR/TOPSAR SYSTEM

The NASA/JPL AIRSAR system is a **three-frequency** airborne SAR system that was developed to be a **general test-bed** for advanced SAR techniques. The SAR system is flown on a NASA DC-8 passenger jet operated by NASA's Ames Research Center in Mountainview, California. The AIRSAR antennas are not **gimaballed**; instead the **dual-polarized**

microstrip antennas are mounted fixed to the body of the DC-8 aft of the left wing. The earliest mode implemented in the AIRSAR system (operational *since* 1988) was the **three-frequency polarimetric** mode, where fully **polarimetric** data **are** acquired simultaneously at C-band, L-band and P-band. This mode was used to provide prototype data for the SIR-C/X-SAR science team and many of the algorithms applied to SIR-C data were developed using **AIRSAR** data.

In 1990 NASA, in collaboration with an Italian consortium (**CORISTA**), approved the addition of another set of C-band antennas to implement a single-pass, fixed baseline **cross-track interferometer (XTI)** for topographic mapping. The C-band antennas were provided by **CORISTA**, while NASA sponsored the system modifications and processor development described by Madsen *et al.* [7]. This mode of the AIRSAR system became known as TOPSAR [8] and data have been acquired since 1991. The original TOPSAR processing software has been updated several times since the original publication in [7]. One version of this updated software was delivered to the Environmental Research Institute of Michigan (**ERIM**) under a contract with the Defence Advance Research Projects Agency (**DARPA**), and is currently **being** used to process the **data** from the **ERIM** IFSARE system. In 1995 **TOPSAR** was extended to **acquire XTI** data simultaneously at C-band and L-band [9]. All TOPSAR interferometers can be **operated** in single or dual baseline modes. For single baseline operation signals **are** transmitted out of one antenna only, and the **received** signals are measured simultaneously through two antennas. In the dual baseline mode, signals are alternately transmitted out of the antennas at either end of the baseline, while the received signals are measured simultaneously through both antennas.

III. PROCESSING APPROACH

The aim of the Integrated **AIRSAR** Processor is to implement a **processing** strategy capable of processing all the modes described above with the same basic processor. Therefore, the processor must automatically produce co-registered **multi-frequency** images, whether *or* not at least one **frequency** was squired in the **interferometric** mode. Madsen *et al.* [7]

describe a way to process single frequency cross-track **interferometry** data. In this approach, the individual images are never explicitly deskewed. Rather, the deskew forms an integral part of the location algorithm; the along-track offset given by Madsen *et al.* [7] is identical to the deskew used in the traditional range-Doppler processor [10].

This follows from the fact that in traditional (**non-interferometric**) SAR processing, it is assumed that the imaged pixel is located at the intersection of the Doppler cone (centered on the velocity vector), the range sphere (centered at the antenna) and an assumed reference plane. Since the Doppler cone has its apex at the center of the range sphere, and its axis of symmetry is aligned with the velocity vector, it follows that all points on the intersection of the Doppler cone and the range sphere lie in a plane orthogonal to the velocity vector. The additional information provided by the **interferometry** is that the imaged point also has to lie on the cone described by a constant phase, which means that one no longer has to assume an arbitrary reference plane. This cone of equal phase has its axis of symmetry aligned with the interferometer baseline and also has its apex at the center of the range sphere. It then follows that the imaged point lies at the intersection of the Doppler cone, the range sphere and the equal phase cone. Using the same argument as before, it is clear that the point still lies in a plane orthogonal to the velocity vector. This **along-track** offset can still be calculated using the traditional expression for the deskew, as shown in Madsen *et al.* [7].

When processing multi-frequency **data**, one has two options to ensure that the output images automatically co-register. In the first approach, the sub-patch size is chosen such that the same number of output lines are kept for all frequencies. (This assumes that the radars operate at the same pulse repetition frequency, which is the case for the AIRSAR system.) All frequencies can then be processed with properly scaled Doppler parameters, meaning that the along-track shift for all frequencies will be the same. **Therefore**, the location parameters derived at any frequency can directly be applied to all the other frequencies. In this case, the size of the **sub-patch** used, as well as the amount of overlap between adjacent sub-patches are determined by the length of the azimuth reference functions at the lowest **frequency**.

There are two main disadvantages to this approach. First, the fixed **number** of output lines for all frequencies means that the processor becomes quite inefficient in the case of the high **frequencies** for which the azimuth **reference** functions **are** much shorter than at the low frequencies, since large parts of the overlap areas between successive **sub-patches are unnecessarily** recalculated. Secondly, since the size of the patch at the high frequencies is large compared to the

synthetic aperture size, the motion compensation may be less than optimum.

These disadvantages can be overcome by processing each frequency separately into the zero squint geometry before utilizing any **interferometric** information. After the deskew is applied, the multi-frequency images **automatically** co-register. This now means that each frequency can be processed with a sub-patch size optimally chosen for that particular frequency. In a sense this follows the same processing paradigm usually employed in repeat-pass interferometry. The **disadvantage**, at least in our implementation, is that the bookkeeping of the phases during motion compensation is slightly more complicated.

The post processing steps applied after the SAR processing depends on the mode in which the data were acquired. For the three-frequency **polarimetric** mode the various cross-products are combined into the standard AIRSAR compressed Stokes Matrix format and then **radiometrically** calibrated.

In the case where **interferometric** data were **acquired**, the **interferogram** phase is first unwrapped and the **slant** range digital elevation model is formed. The location **parameters** for each slant range pixel is now calculated using the elevation model just derived. Since all the images acquired at the different frequencies now are co-registered, the same set of locations ~~parameters~~ can be used to geometrically resample **all** images. These **location** parameters are then used to resample the calibrated **polarimetric** SAR images. In addition to **the** calibrated and geometrically **corrected** SAR images and the digital elevation model, images of the local **incidence** angle and the **interferometric** correlation coefficient are also provided. These images are also geometrically corrected using the location parameters calculated from the **interferometric** phase information.

IV. RESULTS

The performance of the TOPSAR instrument and processor was previously reported by Madsen, *et al.* [7], who compared the radar derived digital elevation models with ones derived using conventional optical stereo techniques. Their analysis showed the difference between the DEMs to be 2.2 m **r.m.s** in relatively flat terrain, and up to 5.0 m in mountainous areas. Instead of repeating these analyses here, we compare the results of the Integrated Processor described here to that of the TOPSAR processor described by Madsen *et al.* [7].

To compare the results of the processors, we processed two strips of data through both processors, and then compared the results. First we tested the relative geometrical accuracy of the two resulting data sets. This is done by cross-correlating

small subsections of the images, and measuring the **along-track** and cross-track offsets between the images. This analysis is repeated for a grid of 100 points spaced uniformly through the images. To test the effect of relief on the results, this comparison was done for a flat area covering the **Bolivar** peninsula near Galveston, Texas, and a mountainous **area** covering part of Mount Rainier in Washington State. The total relief in the **Bolivar** scene is less than 50 m while the total relief in the Mount Rainier scene is about 1500 m. The results of the relative geometry test shows the rms difference between the **Bolivar** images to be 1.3 m in the cross-track direction, and 2.1 m in the along-track direction for a nominal post spacing of 10 m. For the Mount Rainier scenes, the rms difference are 2.3 m and 4.9 m in the cross- and **long-track** directions respectively. This confirms previous reports that results for relatively flat areas are typically better than those for high relief areas.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. J. van Zyl., H.A. Zebker and C. Elachi, "Imaging radar polarization signatures: Theory and observations," *Radio Science*, 22, pp. 529--543, 1987.
- [2] H. A. Zebker, J. J. van Zyl and D. N. Held, "Imaging radar **polarimetry** from wave **synthesis**," *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 92, no. B1, pp. 683--701, 1987.
- [3] J. J. van Zyl, "SAR **polarimetry** and **interferometry**," in *Review of Radio Science 1993-1996*, R.W. Stone (Ed), Oxford University Press, New York, 1996.
- [4] L. C. Graham, "Synthetic Interferometer Radar for Topographic **Mapping**," *Proc. IEEE*, 62, pp.763-768, 1974.
- [5] H. Zebker and R. Goldstein, "Topographic Mapping from **Interferometric SAR Observations**," *J. Geophys. Res.*, 91, pp. 4993-4999, 1986.
- [6] C. T Allen, "Interferometric Synthetic Aperture **Radar**," *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Society Newsletter*, pp. 6-13, September 1995.
- [7] S. N. Madsen, H. A. Zebker, and J. Martin, "Topographic Mapping Using Radar **Intereferometry**: Processing Techniques," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, GRS-31, pp. 246-256, 1993.
- [8] H. A. Zebker, S. N. Madsen, J. Martin, K. B. Wheeler, T. Miller, Y. Lou, G. Alberti, S. Vetrella, and A. Cucci, "The TOPSAR **interferometric** Radar Topographic Mapping Instrument," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, GRS-30, pp. 933-940, 1992.
- [9] J.J van Zyl., H.A. Zebker, S. Hensley and D.R. Haub, "The new dual frequency (C- and L-band) TOPSAR airborne **interferometric SAR**," *Proceedings of IGARSS'95*, Florence, Italy, July 10-14, 1995.
- [10] J. C. Curlander and R. N. McDonough, *Synthetic Aperture Radar Sytems and Signal Processing*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1991.